

## FTL Lessons learned 2/14/11:

### 2. Core Team:

Anne N.

- Problems with people who do not use computers are prevalent
- She now has 2 people looking at 500 timecards between Friday and Monday
- Historical edits are still a problem

Cindy:

- Core Team never had the sense that their opinion counted
- They were pulled along rather than asked for an opinion

### 3. Effort Reporting Processes differ greatly across divisions and sections

- Vicky: business processes should have been defined outside of the tool deployment. We should have a separate team defining the business processes.
- Cindy: agrees, part of the requirements could be documenting 'as is' and how it would change.
- Tim: better appreciation for this late in the project.
- Anne: impacted people's pay, and this built a myth that pay was reduced as a result of the new system.

### 4. Employee on-boarding and summer students

### 5. Solution and Vendor review

- Vicky: we never understood why we hit this bug (percentage allocation). It seemed that it was our parameter space. We should have gone with the activities module, and Kronos should have made a recommendation to so.
- Rich K. – we should have done more due diligence.
- Scott N. – our mixed mode reporting with activities and project and tasks makes this a difficult implementation problem.
- Suzanne G. – identify areas where FNAL is different and pay attention to these in due diligence.
- Tim C. – Move to activities for TD and PPD was maybe not necessary.
- Anne N. – the move to activities caused us more work, because we now have to ensure the availability of activities.
- Tim C. – recognizes the vendor's sweet spot, and leverage this, make sure other areas are supervised.
- Tim C. – Their delivery model is different than Kronos'. Browser interface was a problem.
- Tim C. – We ended up with too many interfaces. Reason is that our infrastructure is very complex.
- Suzanne – Disagrees, Kronos mislead us and we under estimated.
- Tom A. – find yourself with web apps that do not support all browsers
- Scott – Differentiation will bring support issues.
- Mark K. – A compromise in browser compatibility should not compromise the functionality.
- Suzanne – I believe that the diverse browser issue is not an FNAL issues and will get better, because industry and the world is moving towards browser diversification.
- Tim C. – the PEMP to combine time and effort was very burdensome.

### 6. Vendor business Relationship

- Tim C. – for us, maybe a mid-tier player would be more appropriate. The big players have not enough at stake to listen to us.
- Tim C. – require ISO 20k certification.
- Bruce C. – penalty causes must have incentive causes. Executing a penalty cause costs much in lawyers.
- Tom A. – do we have enough expertise to negotiate a managed service contract?
- Vicky – we have to develop these skills more.

#### Go-live Deliberations

- Cindy C.: reporting sub team was either missing or dysfunctional.
- Anne N.: we had it when we did Oracle. They did not feel they had enough hands on with the system.
- Vicky – there should have a core set of reports. In the abstract, independent of the implementation.
- Cindy – usually we know what product then we make the reporting requirements. People were overwhelmed with the fast change in vendor/tool.
- Tim – complexity of the timecards.
- Vicky – if you ask people if we should have gone live, we get conflicting answers. This is an impasse situation. You will never get everyone to agree on this.
- Anne N – if you took the PEMP goal out of there we would not have gone live.
- Everyone agrees.